

FILED  
RICHARD W. NAGEL  
CLERK OF COURT

26 AUG 30 PM 1:18

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DIST. OHIO  
WEST DIV CINCINNATI

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
CIVIL DIVISION

Alexander C. Goldstein

Vs.

United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of Ohio,  
United States Attorney's Office, U.S. Department of Justice,  
Federal Bureau of Investigation,  
U.S Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (AFT), *US Attorney General*

COMPLAINT

I. Parties to the action:

**Plaintiff:**

Alexander C. Goldstein  
2508 Canvasback Circle  
Batavia, OH 45103  
510-459-5000

26:24CV467

JUDGE HOPKINS

JUDGE HOPKINS

**Defendants:**

1. United States Attorney's Office:  
U.S. Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Room 2242  
Washington, DC 20530-0001
2. United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of Ohio:  
~~303 Marconi Boulevard, Suite 200~~ Atrium II 221 E. Fourth St. Suite 400  
Columbus, OH 43215 Cincinnati OH, 45202
3. U.S. Department of Justice:  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue ~~Justice~~  
Washington DC 20530
4. Federal Bureau of Investigation:  
935 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20535-001
5. U.S Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (AFT):  
99 New York Ave. NE  
Washington, DC 20226

M.J. LINCOLN

Atrium II 221 E. Fourth St. Suite 400  
Cincinnati OH, 45202

6. US Attorney General

U.S. Dept. of Justice  
10th and Constitution Ave N.W.  
Room 5111  
Washington, DC, 20530

II. Subject Matter Jurisdiction:

Basis for Jurisdiction:

- A. Arising Under the US Constitution: This case arises under the US constitution as Defendant's are currently violating Plaintiff's Second Amendment Right by denying his right to purchase and own a firearm in violation of Federal Case law precedent.
- B. Federal Question: Defendants are utilizing Federal law to prevent plaintiff from purchasing a firearm under 18 USC 422(g)(4) and are misconstruing the case law.
- C. Plaintiff has also exhausted all avenues through available through California and Ohio law. California ruled that the state lacks any jurisdiction to undo the federal firearm prohibition. Ohio ruled that the state could not provide firearm relief through 34 U.S.C. 40915.

### **III. Statement of Claim:**

1. In 2013 plaintiff was admitted to a facility on a three day voluntary psychiatric hold under CA Welfare and Institutions Code 5150. As part of the psychiatric hold, Plaintiff was prohibited from purchasing/owning a firearm for 5 years under California Health and Welfare Institutions 8103. Plaintiff was never afforded legal counsel and there was no judicial involvement when Plaintiff was stripped of his Second Amendment Rights. Plaintiff has no state weapon restrictions.
2. Because of this psychiatric hold, plaintiff was added to the Federal Firearm Prohibition 18 USC 922(g)(4) ("federal firearm prohibition"). On June 5th, 2023 plaintiff was denied the purchase of a firearm under 18 USC 422(g)(4). This purchase occurred in Kentucky but the prohibition extends to all states.
3. Plaintiff does qualify under any other prohibited person category under 18 USC 422.
4. As noted under Section II, Plaintiff tried to end his firearm prohibition through California and Ohio courts but both courts ruled that they lacked any means to end Plaintiff's Federal Firearm Prohibition.
5. After exhausting relief through state courts, Plaintiff contacted the FBI twice to contest being on the Federal Firearm Registry. Plaintiff presented the FBI case law that proves that Plaintiff was wrongfully put on the Firearm Registry and that his Second Amendment Rights were being violated. The FBI responded both times with a generic refusal. Prior to filing this complaint, Plaintiff wrote a letter to Kenneth L. Parker (United States Attorney for the Southern District of Ohio) asking his office to restore his Second Amendment Right. This letter was sent July 25<sup>th</sup>, 2024 through certified mail.
6. Due to inaction on the part of the Defendant's, Plaintiff has no other recourse besides lawsuit.

### **IV. Previous Lawsuits**

California: 23CV050419, The People of the State of California vs Goldstein, December 8, 2023  
Ohio: In the Matter of Alexander Goldstein, Case Number: MISC, Judge Brock of Clermont County

### **V. Relief:**

Plaintiff asks the court to award relief in the form of:

1. Ordering Defendant's to immediately remove the Plaintiff from the federal firearm registry and fully restore his Second Amendment Right,
2. Either: issuing an order for the Defendant's to erase the history of Plaintiff's firearm prohibition, OR ordering the FBI to issue a document acknowledging that Plaintiff is legally allowed to purchase, own, and carry a firearm,

3. \$2,500 in compensation for legal fees associated with this action,
4. \$15,000 in punitive damages for refusing to rectify the violation of Plaintiff's Second Amendment Rights,
5. And, any other remedy this Court deems proper.

I state under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on  
This 30 day of August, 2024.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Plaintiff